



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/079,618	05/15/98	GRUNDEI	H 8056-80 (E187)
------------	----------	---------	------------------

000570 QM12/0817
PANITCH SCHWARZE JACOBS & NADEL
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE 22ND FLOOR
2005 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

EXAMINER

PHAN, H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 08/17/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/079,618

Applicant(s)

Grundeir et al.

Examiner

Hieu Phan

Group Art Unit
3738



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hieu Phan

(3) Ruy Gar Tia-Damor

(2) Randy Huis

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 4, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Morrey et al. (U.S. Patent 4,608,055)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' argued that reference Morrey et al. did not read on the stem end (30') of the invention. After pointing out the claimed language "a distal end of the shell being bent caudally and constructed as a stem end (30') of claim 1 to the applicants, there was an agreement that the present claimed language of the stem end (30') of the invention could not over come reference Morrey et al. It was also agreed upon that if the applicants were to claimed the stem end (30') in more detail, the invention would over come reference Morrey et al.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.